

form the fluff on the polishing cloth so that the polishing cloth can evenly and continuously polish the semiconductor device.

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 6, 2000, the Examiner indicated that the response filed on December 13, 1999 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action dated July 12, 1999 because twice amended claim 1 did not comply with 37 CFR §1.121 and MPEP 1453. In addition, in that the Examiner recognized that the above-mentioned December 13, 1999 reply was *bona fide*, Applicants have been given a one (1) month deadline for correcting the form of twice amended claim 1. Applicants' counsel wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephonic discussion which identified the corrections necessary, which are set forth in twice amended claim 1, rewritten above. Accordingly, the Examiner will review the above rewritten claim 1 in light of the Remarks filed with the response of December 13, 1999.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the form of the claims, then the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/14/00

By: R. Lee Fraley
R. Lee Fraley
Reg No. 42,550

SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Phone: (602) 382-6270